

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION**

Tammy Lynette Stieglitz,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No.: 2:15-cv-1680-PMD
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
Stryker Corporation,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

This medical device products liability matter is before the Court on Defendant Stryker Corporation's motion for summary judgment (ECF No. 26). Although Plaintiff Tammy Stieglitz has had ample opportunity to oppose the motion, she has not filed any response.

Stryker's motion is well-founded. Under South Carolina law, a plaintiff in a medically complex products liability case "must establish proximate cause through competent expert testimony." *Disher v. Synthes (U.S.A.)*, 371 F. Supp. 2d 764, 772 (D.S.C. 2005). Stieglitz has not proffered any expert evidence. There being no support in the record for that essential element of Stieglitz's claims, *see id.* at 769, summary judgment is warranted, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e)(3).

Therefore, it is **ORDERED** that Stryker's motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



PATRICK MICHAEL DUFFY
United States District Judge

May 16, 2017
Charleston, South Carolina